(e) what is the mark-up allowed on the formulation of each drug and under which category each falls;

(f) whether it is a fact that certain companies made huge unintended benefits on these drugs;

(g) if so, what are the details thereof; and

(h) what is the price fixed of each strength and pack of each formulation based on each drug.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) The 7th Plan working Group on Drugs and Pharmaceuticals have estimated the requirement of anti-TB drugs during 1986-87 as under:

Name of the Bulk Drug		Requirement (Tonnes)
Rifampicin	—	61·22
I.N.H.	—	325·00
PAS	—	250·00
Thiacetazone	—	70·00
Ethambutol	—	310·00
Streptomycin	—	270 00
Pyrazinamide	—	27·50

(b) Details of production of each anti-TB drug in the organised sector during 1984-85 are given below:—

Name of the Bulk Drugs		Production (Tonnes) (1984-85)
INH	—	127·70
PAS	—	119·07
Thia etazone	—	20·39
Ethambutol	—	205·50
Streptomycin	—	235·06
Pyrazinamide	—	2·62

(c) All the anti-TB bulk drugs are being produced either from basic or intermediate stage. Imports of INH, PAS, Thiacetazone, Streptomycin and Ethambutol were nil|negligible during 1983-84. Substantial quantities of Rifampicin and Pyarazinamide are being imported to meet the demand.

(d) Details of imports are published in the Monthly Statistics for Foreign Trade in India, Vol. II copies of which are available in the Parliament Library.

(e) Mark-up allowed in formulations and the category of formulations are contained in DPCO, 1979, a copy of which was laid on the table of the House.

(f) and (g) Certain cases have come to the notice of this Ministry. Action as per the law is on.

(h) The leader prices of formulations would be compiled and laid on the table of the House.

Import of Rifampicin

2848. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Rifampicin is an anti-leprotic drug;

(b) whether it is a fact that this drug is not manufactured and is being imported during the last six years or so;

(c) what is the amount of foreign exchange spent on this drug every year during the last six years;

(d) whether it is a fact that Government allowed approvals to manufacture this drug during the last four years or so;

(e) names of the companies who were granted approvals from January 1981 to 30th November, 1985 along with capacity, stage of manufacture allowed to each;

(f) whether any company has started production;

(g) if so, name of the companies and details of production;

(h) whether it is also a fact that drug companies are not interested to implement

the approvals as they have been making huge unintended benefits since 1980; and

(i) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b), (f) and (g) Production of the bulk drug has recently commenced in the Country. M/s. Lupin Laboratories have reported commencement of production.

(c) Details of imports are published in the Monthly Statistics for Foreign Trade Vol.-II, copies of which are available in the Parliament Library.

(d) Yes, Sir.

(e) Details of industrial approvals issued to the companies are published in the Monthly News Letter of India Investment Centre, copies of which are available in the Parliament Library. All letters of intent are from basic stage.

(h) No, Sir.

(i) Does not arise.

Submission of form 2 under drugs price Control Order, 1979

2849. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) names of the companies who submitted form No. 2 as required under Drugs Price Control Order, 1979 during 1984-85;

(b) names of drugs for which Form 2 was submitted along with specification of drug and country from which imported;

(c) what was the proposed selling price of drug in each case and what price was fixed by Government; and

(d) what is the margin allowed on landed cost as per Drugs Price Control Order and what margin was allowed in each of the above mentioned cases?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) to (d) Information to the extent available would be collected and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha.

Show-cause notices to drug manufacturers

2850. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2272 given in the Rajya Sabha on 19th August, 1985 and state:

(a) when were *prima facie* show cause notices issued to Pfizer, Glaxo and Burroughs Wellcome for contravening the provisions of I(D&R) Act and when was the explanation from each company received;

(b) what were the findings of on-the-spot verification on the basis of which show cause notices were issued;

(c) whether final decision has been taken;

(d) if so, the details thereof;

(e) whether it is a fact that show cause notice has also been issued to Hoechst and Abbott;

(f) if so, when and on what grounds;

(g) whether it is also a fact that these companies installed unauthorised machinery for excess production of those items where they are overcharging the prices; and

(h) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) to (d) The requisite information has been furnished in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2193 dated 9-12-1985.

(e) to (h) M/s. Abbott Laboratories (I) Limited was issued a show cause notice in October, 1985 for non-fulfilment of the conditions regarding ratio parameters. The prices fixed by the Government for Vitamin preparations of this company were struck down by the Bombay High Court. Action to re-fix the prices is on.

The requisite information regarding M/s Hoechst has already been furnished in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 958 dated 25-11-1985.